DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 469 718 SP 041 119

AUTHOR	Beck, Judy; Shanks, Joyce
TITLE	Traversing the Avenues of Change: The Difficult Road of Teacher Education Reform.
PUB DATE	2002-04-05
NOTE	29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 1-5, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Change Strategies; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Instructional Leadership; *Preservice Teacher Education; School Restructuring; Teacher Certification
IDENTIFIERS	Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

This case study examines programmatic change over two years of reforming a teacher education program. Two teacher educators kept ongoing journals of events, reflecting on program faculty's work and progress in supporting change. Early in the process, their journals highlighted labor intensification, with faculty members facing multiple responsibilities. By the spring, they noted problems initiating systemic reform, with so many agendas apparent that it was difficult to find time to build the vision necessary to support programmatic action and change. Over the summer, the educators developed a fifth year certification program that emphasized students being actively involved in their assigned field placements during the entire academic year in order to better integrate theory and practice. By the fall, the educators realized that participants were not being given the time needed to reflect, plan, analyze, and initiate change. They came to understand that the two of them assuming informal leadership and presenting a program model was not the best way to initiate discussions on program reform and lead substantive change. Three themes emerged: the importance of group visioning, the negative effects of rushing change and not supporting group visioning, and the need for leadership to support a healthy learning community. (Contains 18 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 469 718

Traversing the Avenues of Change: The Difficult Road of Teacher Education Reform

Judy Beck and Joyce Shanks

2002

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Judy Beck
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

SP041119

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TM

Traversing the Avenues of Change: The Difficult Road of Teacher Education Reform

by
Judy Beck and Joyce Shanks
University of Wisconsin-La Crosse

a paper presented to the
American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting
April 5, 2002, New Orleans

Since 1983 and the publication of *A Nation at Risk*, there have been ongoing calls for reform in the PK-12 schools. First-wave reform called for increased standards. Second-wave reform literature articulated how to go about changing school practices to support student learning. Second-wave reform agendas raised the issue that teachers must know how to support student learning. Teachers must know how to make learning meaningful to students, apply what students learn to their own lives, give students concrete examples of what they learn, integrate subject matter, and emphasize understanding and critical thinking. With such an emphasis on the role of teachers in reforming schools, it was natural for members of the public, as well as educators, to start to question and critique teacher preparation more than they had in the past.

Since 1986, teacher education reform has been a significant topic of discussion and debate among educators. Teacher education program faculty responded to the call for reform and started to discuss how to prepare teachers for the restructured PK-12 schools. Teacher education program faculty realized that program revisions must examine how subject-matter content classes taught by arts and science faculty, pedagogy classes taught by education faculty, and field experiences occurring in PK-12 schools could be taught so that they are not unrelated and separate experiences occurring throughout students' preparation program. Teacher education programs have to help preservice teachers to integrate their experiences so that content, pedagogy, and practice mesh together and provide the candidates with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions they will need to function in restructured schools.

In *Tomorrow's Teachers*, the Holmes Group (1986) emphasized five goals for teacher education programs: 1) to make the education of teachers intellectually more solid; 2) to recognize differences in teachers' knowledge, skill and commitment in their education, certification, and work; 3) to create standards of entry to the profession—examinations and educational requirements—that are professionally relevant and intellectually defensible; 4) to connect institutions to schools; and 5) to make schools better places for teachers to work and to learn. The Holmes Group members continued their reform recommendations in 1990 with *Tomorrow's Schools* by setting a vision for Professional Development Schools. The principles behind the PDS movement included: 1) teaching and learning for understanding; 2) creating a learning community; 3) teaching and learning for understanding for everybody's children; 4) continuing learning by teachers, teacher educators, and administrators; 5) thoughtful long-term

inquiry into teaching and learning; and 6) inventing a new institution. In *Tomorrow's School of Education*, the Holmes Group (1995) completed their trilogy by making recommendations for exemplary professional practice. The goals include making education schools accountable, strengthening research, connecting education programs with PK-12 schools, and providing leadership and support for educational renewal.

Even though discussions and calls for teacher education reform are well over a decade old, there is still a debate among educators on how to implement change successfully. Fullan, Galluzzo, Morris, and Watson (1998) have discussed the "stall" and even failure of teacher education faculty to build lasting change. The PDS agenda has not been implemented as much as educators may wish to see, the arts and science faculty involved in the preparation of teachers still tend to work in isolation from education faculty, and many underprepared teachers are still teaching in our nation's schools (Fullan et.al.). In addition, Miriam Ben-Peretz (2001) questions whether teacher educators' work can be done successfully because of the varying, and often times conflicting, demands placed on teachers and teacher educators in society.

With such turmoil and questioning of teacher education programs, the two authors of this paper reflect on the ongoing development of a high quality teacher education program at their university. The authors are faculty members in a teacher education program at a Midwest university. They and their colleagues have heard the calls for reform and have discussed programmatic renewal over the course of several years. In preparation for a spring 1998 NCATE (National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education) visit, the program faculty developed a vision and philosophy for the program. The teacher education program's Elementary/Middle Level (EML) and Middle Level/Secondary (MLS) Programs' 1998 NCATE conceptual framework is based on the idea of the teacher as a reflective practitioner. The conceptual framework portrays the teacher as active learner, leader, inquirer, and community member. Since the NCATE visit, the program faculty have continued to discuss the development of a performance-based program with goals similar to those described by the Holmes Group. The faculty have recognized the need to measure a student's progress on more than the candidate's successful completion of credits. Instead, a student must show the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to be a quality teacher. The program faculty have yet to operationalize how this will be implemented in the program. The program faculty have, however, begun to update the curriculum with an increased emphasis on quality field experiences.

The purpose of this paper is to present a case study and analysis of programmatic change over two years in the reform of a teacher education program. The authors keep an ongoing journal of events throughout the two years, reflecting on the work and progress of the program faculty in supporting change. The chronicle also provides data as necessary to provide background information and clarify events. Interspersed with the journal, the authors reflect on and analyze program reform over time. The

authors chronicle the change process, giving both a description and narration designed to complement the accompanying analysis utilizing research literature and program data.

Fall 1999 Journals

September 11, 1999 Judy

I was named Co-MLS Director on September 1, my birthday. What a birthday present it was. I am excited to lead the MLS program at this time as we work toward implementing PI 34, the newly established requirements for state certification and licensure. These rules go into effect on July 1, 2000. These new rules support the goals I envision for our program. They also complement the NCATE requirements for program accreditation. Although our timeline for implementing the new requirements is short, these requirements provide us with the perfect avenue to initiate new discussions about our programs.

I am eager to take on this responsibility, but I am concerned about my other responsibilities. In addition to my full teaching load, which also includes an overload facilitating the Learning Community masters program, and the expectations for scholarship and service--so important as a junior faculty member, I am also Director of the NASA Science Service Center and Director of a regional Junior Science and Humanities Symposium. As a matter of fact, we leave for a three-day trip with high school students and teachers to the north woods of Wisconsin in another week. These responsibilities are fairly labor intensive when I need to do all the administrative and clerical work for these programs.

At yesterday's joint program (EML and MLS) meeting, we had a positive start. We looked at the student program evaluations from the last three semesters as well as the new requirements for certification and licensure. We assigned work groups to examine these documents and summarize findings for the next joint program meeting. I think we are heading in the right direction.

September 11, 1999 Joyce

I am eager for the new year. We have had a year since our last NCATE review. We took a break from work on NCATE, but the new state licensure requirements going into effect for new freshmen starting the Fall of 2000 at the university make this a very good opportunity for continuing our work on program reform. We have a good conceptual framework and program standards. Faculty worked to align their syllabi to the new framework, but we need to move further along now. Individual classes align, but the real work ahead will be to make sure all the classes are part of a cohesive program. This agenda should lead to finding overlaps and holes in the program that will necessitate course redesign and perhaps some adding or dropping of courses. I think this will be more difficult than designing a conceptual framework, since this is where the real "buy in" must take place. Judy had a good start with the MLS program. The student evaluations should be a neutral way to identify weaknesses and starting places for change using concrete data. This way, no individual faculty members will need to give their opinion on what may be weaknesses within a variety of courses.

I am eager to initiate this process, but I also will admit to worrying how it will get done. It is going to be hard to identify extra hours free to meet and accomplish the agenda. I know this is going to be the case for most, if not all, faculty. My big push is to work on initiating partnerships. I spend any extra hours in my schools. I teach the Level I Clinical Experience which university students take as they are just starting the teacher education program, before formal admittance into the program. It is for the PK-12 students who are not yet separated and following their own program (Elementary, Elementary/Middle Level, or Middle Level/Secondary) requirements. We have the first clinical in rural schools to give the students more of a varied experience (as much as our program can provide based on our geographical area). I work with two districts. One district is 25 miles north of the university, and the other district is 25 miles south of the university. Driving to and working with the two districts involves a lot of time.

I am very happy to work in the clinical program. I find the work to be very rewarding. The educators in the two districts warmly welcome and receive our students. The work, however, is labor intensive. For example, last year I spent 130 hours fall semester and 115 hours spring semester doing clinical work. I have been working with educators in one of the districts particularly closely to develop our partnership in mutually beneficial ways. We have been trying to support our partnership using a technology agenda. We want to support both preservice and inservice teachers' use of technology in ways to support their students' learning and inclusion of technology in the curriculum. To accomplish this goal, we have been working on grants to support us in the effort. We did one regional and two national presentations discussing our efforts. This type of work takes time and energy. Yes, I am happy to do it and want to continue to do it, but I also wonder where the extra hours will come for the program renewal agenda. I have discussed clinical hours here, but I have not even mentioned the time issue in relation to the rest of my teaching, research, and service. Good luck to us, Judy.

October 8, 1999 Judy

Our EML and MLS programs took another important step today. After the work groups presented their program evaluation findings at our last meeting, we were able to discuss the general themes that emerged from the program evaluations. Themes included program overlap, technology, accommodating students, modeling best practice, faculty presence in schools, quality field placements, assessment, and classroom management techniques. Although this process was time consuming, it was important for us to have a common understanding of student perceptions of the program. This can be an important first step in the change process.

October 9, 1999 Joyce

I think we have additional support for the program reform agenda. I am co-chairing the Fieldwork Partnership Committee for the School of Education. Our committee's goal this year is to study school/university partnerships and how to develop them to

I am a little concerned over the goals and directions we are taking as a program in terms of NCATE accreditation. During the last NCATE visit during the spring of 1998, I was one of the co-coordinators of the process. I directed all the work related to the conceptual framework and feel as though I have a pretty good understanding of where our strengths and weaknesses are. I have been asked to address this issue in meetings with the Dean, the administrative team made up of program directors and chairs, and now, today, to the School of Education faculty. Looking at the new professional development school standards put out by NCATE, what NCATE listed as our program weaknesses at its last visit, and what we have accomplished during the last year-and-a-half, I am concerned with what I perceive to be a lack of progress.

The other person presenting on NCATE at today's meeting was the other co-coordinator for the last NCATE visit. We both discussed how we need full faculty and administrative support for the NCATE process, and that we need to start to work quickly on the agendas. Program reform will be particularly difficult if we continue to have the change in leadership we have been having. No leader has been in place for more than two years in the recent past. At the NCATE visit we were told we don't have the faculty, support staff, and resources to accomplish our goals. We must study the costs carefully and be honest about what the program (not just the NCATE agenda) needs to be successful with its goals. I fully support NCATE for I feel it has been a impetus for program renewal. Yet I perceive some people, particularly at the level of administration, assume it is a report to write and that we can approach the program renewal process similarly. I see NCATE as an opportunity. Our program is in a state that is implementing massive licensure changes. The changes complement what NCATE is asking for in its accreditation process. Lets accept this as a challenge and work on developing our performance-based program designed with rich school experiences. If we are all committed to the process shouldn't we be fighting harder to get the faculty, resources, and program changes?

October 30, 1999 Joyce

It is again a Saturday as I am getting around to write in this journal. I am getting a little worried about this writing project and saving the time needed to work on it, let alone the program renewal process. It has been a very busy couple of weeks. I teach two sections of the Introduction to Education class along with the Level I Clinical Experience. This class is designed as one of the two formal "writing emphasis" classes that the students need to complete as part of their university requirements for graduation. The students also know that this class is an important part of their process of formally applying for admission into the teacher education program. As a result, the students each semester are very serious about their work in the class and their quality of writing. They know if they do not do well in the writing emphasis course that it can negatively impact their program admittance. I have them write in class every week. They have seventeen assignments (of varying lengths) which they must complete. The assignments mean a lot of reading and correcting

I am a little concerned over the goals and directions we are taking as a program in terms of NCATE accreditation. During the last NCATE visit during the spring of 1998, I was one of the co-coordinators of the process. I directed all the work related to the conceptual framework and feel as though I have a pretty good understanding of where our strengths and weaknesses are. I have been asked to address this issue in meetings with the Dean, the administrative team made up of program directors and chairs, and now, today, to the School of Education faculty. Looking at the new professional development school standards put out by NCATE, what NCATE listed as our program weaknesses at its last visit, and what we have accomplished during the last year-and-a-half, I am concerned with what I perceive to be a lack of progress.

The other person presenting on NCATE at today's meeting was the other co-coordinator for the last NCATE visit. We both discussed how we need full faculty and administrative support for the NCATE process, and that we need to start to work quickly on the agendas. Program reform will be particularly difficult if we continue to have the change in leadership we have been having. No leader has been in place for more than two years in the recent past. At the NCATE visit we were told we don't have the faculty, support staff, and resources to accomplish our goals. We must study the costs carefully and be honest about what the program (not just the NCATE agenda) needs to be successful with its goals. I fully support NCATE for I feel it has been a impetus for program renewal. Yet I perceive some people, particularly at the level of administration, assume it is a report to write and that we can approach the program renewal process similarly. I see NCATE as an opportunity. Our program is in a state that is implementing massive licensure changes. The changes complement what NCATE is asking for in its accreditation process. Lets accept this as a challenge and work on developing our performance-based program designed with rich school experiences. If we are all committed to the process shouldn't we be fighting harder to get the faculty, resources, and program changes?

October 30, 1999 Joyce

It is again a Saturday as I am getting around to write in this journal. I am getting a little worried about this writing project and saving the time needed to work on it, let alone the program renewal process. It has been a very busy couple of weeks. I teach two sections of the Introduction to Education class along with the Level I Clinical Experience. This class is designed as one of the two formal "writing emphasis" classes that the students need to complete as part of their university requirements for graduation. The students also know that this class is an important part of their process of formally applying for admission into the teacher education program. As a result, the students each semester are very serious about their work in the class and their quality of writing. They know if they do not do well in the writing emphasis course that it can negatively impact their program admittance. I have them write in class every week. They have seventeen assignments (of varying lengths) which they must complete. The assignments mean a lot of reading and correcting

for me. I take this role very seriously and read every word the students write, correcting their assignments based on grammar, writing quality, and development of their reflectivity since student reflection is the number one goal of the course based on our program standards. After the students have received about four weeks of feedback on their writing, they see the pattern developing in my comments. As a result, during the second month of the semester I have many students coming in for tutoring help in their writing or their reflection. I have started to keep track of this in hours. I spend about seven to ten hours a week correcting papers and an additional five to seven hours tutoring students. This is making other agendas hard to manage.

An example of the time pressures was this Thursday, October 28. Thursday is my day to work since I do not have classes and am not usually in schools unless one of my three student teachers wants me to observe on that day--I see each student teacher once every two weeks for an average of two to three hours each visit. On Thursday, I spent all morning with a PK-12 district educator on our technology grant that I am working on to help develop our partnership. I drove back and met for one hour with the principal involved in the Fieldwork Partnership Committee on the grant we want to write. I spent one hour meeting with students to tutor them in their writing. I then had the Board of Review from 3:00-6:00 which involves meeting with masters degree students on their program requirements. So between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. I had no breaks and no lunch. I could start my own work in the evening. This was a light day because it was a non-teaching day.

December 2, 1999 Joyce

Our Fieldwork Partnership Committee members met today and reported on our professional development school research. It was a good meeting and committee members were excited about the research and eager to see the School of Education faculty pursue these goals. I will write the summary of our committee's points to begin our report that we must present to the School of Education faculty. The themes which we agreed on after our presentation of research include: 1) the importance of building true collaboration between PK-12 schools and schools of education; 2) the issue that both cultures will need to form a new culture where mutual respect is critically important; 3) both organizations will need to change, with programs and schools quite different from what we have seen in the past; 4) roles of educators in both organizations will need to change; 5) trust must be developed and earned over time, it cannot be mandated or required yet is vital to the success of any partnership; and 6) learning and reflection must be an ongoing process for all educators. I am as pleased as I can be to see these goals come through. They are what I believe is crucially important to develop partnerships. They will demand that our clinical faculty's work in schools be valued. I believe these goals are central issues and values needed for true, lasting, and successful program reform.

December 3, 1999 Judy

I only have a few minutes before my PRT (retention) meeting. I did want to take a little time, however, to discuss our MLS program meeting. Two faculty members presented the preliminary report from a task force made up of faculty and area educators. This task force examined the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed for teachers in the 21st Century. This preliminary report parallels what our program work groups have found. This further solidifies the need for change in our program. I hope my PRT Committee members recognize that the leadership I am trying to provide for the MLS program is supported and complemented by the work of others.

December 12, 1999 Judy

Apparently not! I received my retention letter yesterday. Although I was retained for another year, the PRT Committee's letter spelled out nine areas for my consideration. Most of the concerns addressed in the letter revolved around my role and responsibilities being the Director of the Science Center, advertising its existence, and increasing its usage. My concern is that to accomplish the additional expectations for the Science Center is going to take a lot of extra time to be successful as compared to the advertising and teacher contact I already have. Is this the best use of my time? The additional hours will have to come from somewhere. I am not willing to let it come from my teaching. If I want to be tenured, it cannot come from my scholarship. The only area left is the third area on which I am evaluated, and that is service. So, should I not spend as much time on program renewal? Should I not be MLS Program director? Should I be selfish and address personal scholarship and retention goals rather than program goals?

Fall 1999 Reflection: Labor Intensification and PRT Issues

A major theme developing so far in our journals on the process of program renewal is the theme of labor intensification. Labor intensification in university faculty work, especially in relation to work in PK-12 schools, is not new. When program faculty consider the major work needed for program renewal, however, this issue needs to be of renewed focus.

The semester's journals have provided evidence of faculty who have multiple responsibilities. Responsibilities based on teaching, scholarship, and service are demanding. These responsibilities are particularly an issue because of the increasing expectations of education faculty who spend many hours in schools. It takes time to travel to schools. Additionally, many faculty have a number of schools to which they must travel. Faculty need to take time to get to know teachers so as to build the rapport needed to discuss the growth and development of preservice teachers. This communication is an essential component of a collaborative field-based program. If teacher education program faculty do not take the time to develop rapport and communication, there will not be adequate groundwork laid for successful field experiences for teacher education students working in schools.

The ongoing development of school-university partnerships amplifies the need for the development of good working relationships among educators. Professional development schools will require rapport and good communication yet will also require the development of a new learning community based on trust. Trust cannot be mandated. It takes years to develop an environment based on trust, where professionals are willing to take risks and challenge their practices to work toward a new collaborative learning environment. The results of partnership efforts will mean university faculty will spend increasing time in schools; therefore, faculty will not spend as much time at the university. Faculty roles within a professional development school will change and develop over time. As a result, the expectations and evaluation of faculty work on campus need to change.

Promotion, retention, and tenure (PRT) demands were originally developed based on traditional roles and responsibilities of faculty members. Advancement decisions are based on teaching, scholarship, and service. At most comprehensive universities an average teaching load is twelve semester credits. The rest of the week is presumably spent in teaching preparation, scholarship, and university and professional service. For those teacher educators who spend a lot of time in schools, this formula is not so simple. Faculty must spend many hours and even years to develop and nurture relationships. For example, NCATE PDS standards suggest that faculty spend no less than one day a week in schools (NCATE, 2000). These hours are typically deemed as service in the PRT process. These hours vastly exceed the expectations that most PRT Committees have for university service. If the faculty members do not spend these hours in schools, they will have trouble developing healthy partnerships and the preservice teachers will ultimately suffer. If they do spend the hours in the schools the faculty do not have as much time to spend in areas that will make PRT Committees look at them more favorably.

This concept is particularly important to consider since the bar for tenure and promotion at the university level is rising. According to Wilson (2001), there is increasing pressure on junior faculty members at comprehensive universities to publish more and publish quickly. Some universities have even speeded up the tenure process by holding a pre-tenure review in the third or fourth year. If junior faculty do not appear to be on track for a successful tenure bid, these faculty members are non-renewed.

Judy is not yet tenured. The university policy may emphasize teaching, scholarship, and service as part of her tenure process, but at her PRT meeting this fall Judy's program work and work in schools seemed to be viewed as less valuable than her efforts in scholarship and teaching. Teaching effectiveness is partly measured based on the statistically-computed "SEI" or Student Evaluation of Instruction score. Judy's additional administrative work, along with her overload in teaching as part of the Learning Community masters program, does not seem to be valued. The time spent in schools takes time away from research and writing that is of utmost importance for being tenured and promoted. Yet what will help us to build program renewal? Judy's NASA Center is

helpful to area teachers. Her time spent in schools is crucial if we are to build school-university partnerships. Doing so could well jeopardize Judy's chance at tenure. Is it fair to ask her or any other junior faculty to put the program before their own chance of success at the university? Should the responsibility of working in schools be given only to tenured faculty? This would, indeed, be a shame since so many junior faculty are eager and excited to work with area educators, many of them only recently having left the PK-12 schools for university life, thus giving them a credibility in schools that those who left PK-12 schools years earlier may not be granted.

School of education faculty must examine reward structures that honor various kinds of work and are not so narrow in focus. Tierney (2001) states, "If the work of schools of education is ever to change, then the reward structure that exists for school of education faculty must change" (p. 551). One suggestion made by Tierney is to reform the tenure codes by redefining what a faculty member needs to do to earn tenure. Under this new model, "members of a faculty could focus specifically on what they wish to honor in the evaluation of their work" (p.552). In this system, a faculty member could chose work with schools or program renewal as a focus of his/her work along with other teaching responsibilities and committee work. Of course, this structure is not without consequences. Earning tenure under this policy at one university might not be helpful in finding a job at another university. It may also "further erode the status of education faculty members" on their own campus (p. 552).

Spring 2000 Journals

January 13, 2000 Joyce

We had a meeting with some of the elementary teachers from a school with which we are working to write grants to develop a charter school (on the way to being a professional development school). They seem eager. Why is it that some of the development with schools seem to be progressing more rapidly than our own program development? This concerns me. Though I am eager to see the interest and progress with school people, I am concerned that it will be difficult to progress rapidly with schools without some substantive work with our own program. Right now, we are not ready to have more site-based instruction or to have a cadre of students have extended time in a school for our program is not structured to accommodate this, even though I think the faculty would support the idea.

January 22, 2000 Judy

Yesterday's joint program (EML and MLS) meeting had to be used as small group work time. It is too bad this type of program review work has to be during program meeting time, but this is the only time the faculty can get together particularly because of so many program faculty saving half days for field work. My hope is that these work groups can provide a productive start to program renewal.

February 5, 2000 Judy

A School of Education faculty member presented a proposal for an alternative program design in collaboration with a content area colleague. This proposal had some exciting ideas. The program faculty were positive about the proposal.

Rather than discussing the intricacies of this proposal, what is interesting to note is the speed with which this idea was discussed by the MLS faculty. Granted, it took the faculty member time to develop the proposal separate from working with program faculty. However, if we examine other attempts at program change, we realize it has been over a semester and our MLS program faculty are still reviewing program evaluations (student feedback on program evaluations on 9/11/99) with no action yet taken for program redesign. Am I missing a faster way to initiate program change?

March 13, 2000 Judy

It is a much needed spring break. Last Friday, I had a stress test because of my reoccurring chest pains. I taught in Learning Communities all weekend (Saturday 8:00-4:30 and Sunday 8:00-3:30). Then today, I had a meeting that was attended by people who will vote on my retention. This meeting was called because a faculty member questioned where I place my work priorities. This faculty member's idea of where and on what I should spend my time is not my vision for my role as a faculty member.

My vision is to continue to develop an excellent, field-based MLS Program. My frustration lies in the poor attendance at our program meetings. Twice this semester we've had only one or two people attend. Granted, I realize that one reason why people don't attend is that some program faculty are in other meetings or in schools at the same time. We are now half way through the semester, and I wonder if we will get our program renewal work accomplished. Yet again, I need to ask myself how am I supposed to do what my PRT asked for and accomplish the program goals. We have accomplished so little to this point in time. Will I accomplish this agenda and also maintain my health?

March 13, 2000 Joyce

Our meeting with another faculty member, our department chair, myself as your PRT Chair, and you should be a reminder to all of us to not expect you to do too much in program renewal work. What is your job description? I guess it is true that when you were hired we did not specifically say for you to work on program renewal or developing partnerships. Have we done that for any individual faculty member? I am not really sure. I know we are hoping to get someone knowledgeable in the area for our next director of teacher education. But you were hired to work in science and general methods for the MLS program. Is it fair of us to ask you to do these other things and then have you be challenged that you are not doing enough? (I honestly question how much more is feasible for you to do. I think you have done as much as possible in this area.) It is unconscionable to ask you to work on partnerships and/or program development if it takes time away from what you need to do to be tenured and promoted.

How can we ask any faculty member to do this? I know personally, since I am tenured, I can spend more of my time on this agenda. Yet I also am well aware of how much of my "scholarship" time has gone to this agenda instead of my individual research and publication agenda. I absolutely know and accept that it would negatively affect my ability to go up for promotion to full professor; so I will not even attempt it in the near future.

Should you keep up your program and partnership work and risk suffering any consequences? Should I be encouraging you in your program work?

March 24, 2000 Judy and Joyce

Today we had a School of Education retreat specifically to discuss our new organization. The history behind our reorganizations is long. Seven years ago we were a College of Education. We merged in with liberal studies to form a new college. Then two years ago we went through a second forced reorganization to merge with the College of Health, Physical Education and Recreation. Now that we are in a new college, we are being asked to examine our department structure. We had been three departments that were already collapsed to two departments earlier this academic year. Now there is a proposal to move to one department of education within our larger college. We are asked to decide whether we want to keep the two departments or move to one department.

This reorganization has the potential for being a major focus of discussion for the rest of the semester. We hope our leaders are cognizant of the fact that program faculty have a lot of work to do. Here we (the authors) have been lamenting over the stagnation of the program renewal process. Leaders need to give their workers, especially the change agents, time to frame and build change. Time will become exceedingly more difficult to save for the change agenda if we need to focus on extended discussions about organizational structure.

The role of leaders is so crucial in our program right now. Leaders are those who move the system forward. They need to act strategically to sequence change and build linkages for change (Schlechty, 1997). Change can't be pushed, but factors limiting change must be removed (Senge, 1990). Our programs are slowly trying to accomplish the goals of a performance-based program with tighter linkages between the elements of the program. Leaders need to make sure we continue with the steps we've initiated so we can continue our work. They also need to make sure other factors that may limit our success are not introduced. Unfortunately, this reorganization may well become a factor that sidelines our change agenda in favor of bureaucratic discussions that fill our work time. As workers, we need support now to keep our eyes on the goal of program reform.

March 31, 2000 Judy

What a couple of weeks since spring break! We had a MLS program meeting today at which we decided to develop a committee to examine possibilities for a new MLS program design. Although I am excited to take action on the program, how feasible is it for

me to assume I can work on this agenda when I will be so busy for the next three weeks? I have a half-day NASA workshop tomorrow. I will be in Orlando for National Science Teachers Association for 6 days this coming week. I will have 4 hours of facilitator training for Learning Communities two days after that in addition to my regular weekend Learning Community class meeting. Since I will be out-of-town on Advising Day, I will have 11 extra hours of advising upon my return. I will have 13 1/2 hours of growth conferences to monitor clinical students while they are out in the field. I have a half-day regional educators meeting. I need to be a judge at an area science fair. I am out in schools during the mornings to be with the clinical students during five weeks of field time. I have a physician's appointment as a follow-up check to see if I have cancer, and my husband is having surgery as well. As a result, I have 19 straight days without a free day to catch up on work—and that first free time is Easter weekend.

So Joyce, why did we sign up to work on the new program? When should we meet? I am worried that if we are able pull something together, I am not sure it will even be addressed. The faculty seem to be more focused on the discussions we are having related to what our new departmental structure will be. I can see, however, why faculty feel the discussion on organization takes precedence over program renewal.

April 8, 2000 Joyce

We were able to get our technology grant completed and turned in. The professional development report is coming along. I feel like I have been teaching in my free time.

April 14, 2000 Judy and Joyce

A group of concerned students made a presentation at the School of Education meeting today. They did a very good job of polling students and sharing their concerns about the teacher preparation program. Their report supported some of what our own reform goals include, namely, portfolio and performance-based assessment. Maybe their proactivity is showing that some of our goals for reflectivity and developing proactive teacher-leaders are working.

A second part of the meeting was on our new department restructuring vote. This is particularly frustrating to be working on now. We want to look at program renewal, and yet we have so much else occurring at the same time. We are now in our second year of interim leadership. We have been forced to look at another department/college reorganization. (Joyce: This is the third time I have lived through reorganization plans in seven years.) There is a general fear, valid or not, that our program is being asked to downsize. We are examining our department structure and spending a good deal of time on that instead of on our program development. We understand how important organization is, but can't form follow function? Could we be given the time needed to plan our new program before we have to do this? I fear our faculty, out of necessity, is focusing on other issues. With the final vote of 13-13 on the reorganization vote, it is obvious we still have some issues to address. The dean supports the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

reorganization and will forward the recommendation to reorganize to the Faculty Senate.

Sunday, May 7, 2000 Judy

What a great weekend! Our Learning Community's capstone project showcase was Saturday and provided a good finish to the two-year program. This was a needed shot in the arm after the frustrations of the stagnation of the MLS program this year. At the April 28 program meeting (which I could not attend because of a grant workshop I had to direct), we laid out what needs to be done for the following year. The bad part was that no plans were set for how to implement these goals only more of what we need to "discuss" in the fall. I am frustrated that we have had much discussion and no action. Then during our May 5 School of Education meeting, all concern was on reorganization rather than program issues or program redesign. All work was tabled to make way for reorganizational issues.

Sunday, May 7, 2000 Joyce

This has been as frustrating of a week as I have ever had at the university. A first reason is that I have chaired the search and screen committee for our new director of teacher education this year. We brought in a final candidate, and I fear our search will not be successful. This will mean interim leadership again next year for the third straight year. That will have to make the change process more difficult.

Secondly, the Faculty Senate voted to support the reorganization. This vote means we will need to spend time next year on rebuilding morale after a divisive process. We will also need to develop new bylaws. From where will the time come to accomplish these tasks? I had wanted to speak at the meeting but I had a clinical orientation meeting for fifty students for the fall semester that had already been planned. The meeting prevented me from getting to the Faculty Senate meeting in time to hear anything but the vote. (Actually, it was one of those weeks where I did not know until Thursday that my family had been trying to reach me all week. They called starting at 7:00 a.m. until 11:00 p.m. every day of the week, only I was never still home that late in the morning or home that early in the evening to receive their calls. Finally, my mother called me on Thursday morning at the office to check and see if I was still alive and healthy. Is this a normal schedule?)

Thirdly, our Fieldwork Partnership Committee had our final report on professional development schools and our recommendations for our teacher education program in relation to licensure and accreditation. Because of looking at too many other reorganizational issues on Friday, May 5 at our School of Education meeting, the report was tabled. This report was a report by faculty from the School of Education, others from the university, and area school personnel, all supporting our program reform efforts, however, the report will not even be addressed this year. We will have a new department chair and director of teacher education next year. Will the report be examined then?

That is why it has been a frustrating week. The semester is finishing up with our students, yet all my possible free time has been spent on report writing and committee work (the one search and screen committee ended up being 180 hours at the end of my tabulation of hours). I am bothered by that. I had a great group of students, and I question whether I was able to give them adequate attention. I don't think I have touched the other research agenda on which I am working this entire semester.

All of this outside work, yet I still wonder how much we have accomplished. I need to seriously consider how much time I spend on committee work. All of us in the program need to seriously consider how our meeting time is spent. Are we making the best use of time or are we spending too much time in less important agendas? In my fatigue, I question if, somehow, the status quo works to keep us busy in mundane, urbane activities to avoid change. If this pace keeps up, can the status quo put brakes on even our dreams, in addition to our actual progress?

Spring 2000 Reflection: The Difficulty of Supporting the Change Process

The spring 2000 semester is one of frustration and shows the difficulty of initiating "systemic" reform. The program faculty obviously had many agendas on which to work. There were so many agendas that it was difficult to spend the time needed to continue to build the vision necessary to support programmatic action and change. Faculty were at loose ends working toward such a variety of goals. Because of labor intensification and multiplicity of demands on their time, faculty lacked the time needed to look comprehensively at programmatic change. This issue will be analyzed by examining change processes.

Schlechty (1997) discusses three types of change. One type of change is procedural. This type of change deals with the steps and order in which particular tasks are accomplished. A second type of change is technical. This type of change relates more to how a particular task is accomplished. A third type of change is structural and cultural (systemic) change. This type of change involves the nature by which work itself is done. An example of these three types of change can be illustrated with a discussion of portfolios. Determining what order data needs to be collected by candidates for use in their portfolio is an example of procedural change. Deciding whether students' portfolios should be paper or webbed-based is an example of technical change. Using evaluations of portfolios to initiate and sustain programmatic improvement is an example of structural change.

Schlechty's work provides insight into the type of change occurring within our program this semester. The faculty had to spend time on College/School/Department reorganization. This is a good example of procedural change for faculty. This reorganization discussion demanded time and attention of faculty to make recommendations as to what the new organization would look like and be named. These were important issues about which faculty had strong opinions. Yet at the same time, these issues were ancillary to the larger structural and cultural change process involved in looking at programmatic reform. At the MLS

Program meeting on April 28, faculty decided to make licensure changes the focus of the next school year even though it was a stated goal for the present year last September. The faculty was involved in procedural and technical issues instead. The School of Education tabled the Professional Development Schools report produced by the Fieldwork Partnership Committee (made up of collegiate and PK-12 educators) even though the report had been requested by the interim leaders at the beginning of the academic year, hence, procedural change.

Any educators involved in a structural and/or cultural change process must seriously consider the time commitment necessary for such a large agenda. Change is difficult enough without having too many other agendas occupying faculty members' time. Too many of these outside pressures make it easy to have what Louis and Miles (1990) term "shallow coping," doing enough change to get by. Faculty may be willing to initiate small changes, but large-scale change can be over-whelming, causing some people to resist.

Ancillary items, even important ones, cannot be allowed to interfere with or replace the larger structural change process. Procedural and technical change can too easily be viewed as "safe" changes for these faculty. For example, the reorganization process described in the journals during Spring 2000 placed a heavy emphasis on "safe change," i.e. procedural and technical change. The emphasis on reorganization led faculty to spend so much time on this issue that there was not enough time to plan, initiate, and support substantive program reform.

Fullan (2001) quotes Petronious from almost two thousand years ago as having similar problems.

> We trained hard… but it seemed every time we were beginning to form up into teams we were reorganized. I was to learn later in life that we tend to meet any situation by reorganizing, and what a wonderful method it can be for creating the illusion of progress while producing confusion, inefficiency, and demoralization (Gaynor, 1977, p. 28 as cited in Fullan, p. 43).

Summer 2000 Narrative and Reflection (Judy and Joyce): Individual Vision Building and Learning

This summer we (Judy and Joyce) decided to press the issue of programmatic reform. We met on our own to develop a fifth year certification program for the MLS program. The proposed program completely redesigned the MLS initial certification program rather than being a mere reshuffling of courses. The proposed program would cover fifteen months from one June through the following August. The program emphasized students being actively involved in their assigned field placement during the entire academic year, so as to better integrate theory and practice. We integrated foundations, curriculum, and methodology courses and so crossed traditional teacher education boundaries. Assessment portfolios would be expected of all students to monitor their knowledge, skills, and dispositions over time.

On the one hand, this program proposal was fun to write. In the summer, we could take the time to discuss and reflect on an

improved program. It was pleasant to spend time with a colleague dreaming of the possibilities of what program goals could best support our vision of a successful beginning teacher. So much of our work at the university has been procedural and technical change, examining smaller issues. The process gave us a chance to step back and look at the bigger picture, visioning the potential for a teacher education program.

On the other hand, we fully realize that we were acting on our own, without the knowledge and input of other faculty. We realize that not having other faculty involved in the process was a weakness of our work. How can we expect other faculty to endorse our work when they did not have a chance to offer input? We think the best way to handle this proposal is to present it to the MLS program faculty at one of its meetings as a starting point for discussion, not as a proposal that we expect to see adopted without substantive discussion and rewrite. We want to let faculty know we do not want to usurp their program visioning process, but we want to give them something to help initiate discussion rather than trying to "reinvent the teacher education wheel" as a large group.

We realize that we are in a difficult position. When one examines the research on change, one can see the visioning process is difficult, particularly when done in isolation from other faculty. However, the culture of teaching perpetuates isolationism and privativism (Fullan 1993). Yet if we are going to change, we need action; we need a shared vision. Fullan discussed how personal and shared vision-building must be done simultaneously. Schlechty (1997) said we can develop a vision but without community, the vision has no meaning. Since we did not take the time to do this we could limit the potential for programmatic reform. Though we recognize the limitations of this renegade approach, we feel this was a worthy gamble. It has the potential to be a positive step forward. How else are we to initiate change when there is no time?

Fall 2000 Journals

Friday, September 1, 2000 Joyce

It is the end of the opening-week activities. We have a new department chair (in a new, reorganized department) and a new interim associate dean/director of teacher education for the next two years. The lack of consistency in leadership will play a factor in long-term program development. How are we to develop a program with interim leadership at the helm? Our program will have had a total of seven years in nine with interim leadership. Since we are a new department, we will need to write new bylaws. We need to write some assessment reports for state licensing. The committee meeting today also talked about developing a new faculty and staff handbook. It sounds as though our agenda is already starting to fill up and we have not put program reform into the picture yet.

September 29, 2000 Judy

Today we had a good conversation about our proposed 5th Year Program at the MLS meeting. Eight out of thirteen faculty

attended the meeting. Joyce and I shared our ideas that we developed over the summer. We tried to present the proposal as a starting point for discussion and not as a "packaged deal." Now after the initial presentation today, I hope our program faculty continue to discuss how program renewal can become reality.

The program faculty directed me as Director of the MLS program to write a letter to the department chair requesting that she grant release time to program directors. As a not-yet-tenured faculty member I feel uncomfortable making this demand. I certainly see the need for release time to coordinate the work I hope we will do in the program this year; however, I am uncomfortable being the one to ask. Will this be viewed as being self-serving?

October 20, 2000 Judy

At our program meeting today, we discussed an individual faculty member's new partnership with a local high school. She would have liked help and support to initiate the program, but she needed to do it on her own to get the program started in time to suit the high school teachers. Here is another example of a faculty member acting in "renegade" fashion. The person wanted to work with the program faculty, but the university time frame for change is slow. Public schools personnel assume we can make changes fairly quickly in our programs. If faculty members initiate changes in their classes in isolation, they can change fairly quickly. Yet, if we want faculty to initiate programmatic change with program faculty input, the process can be fairly lengthy. Can we blame faculty for doing things on their own when if they wait for program approval their window of opportunity may close?

November 17, 2000 Judy

I was so frustrated that only 4 people showed up at our MLS program meeting. The past two meetings were canceled due to a lack of a quorum. I am tired of going to meetings when we can't get anything accomplished because there is not a quorum. Soon thereafter we adjourned to meet jointly with the EML program in order to get something accomplished. At the joint meeting, one faculty member presented on the new special education program she developed. Apparently, the MLS program is not the only program where it seems faculty need to work individually to bring forth new ideas. Since our first program meeting in the fall we have not discussed the 5th Year Program. It will soon be another semester of no program change.

December 1, 2000 Judy

At today's SOE meeting we focused on the new PI 34 certification requirements. The discussion focused more specifically on the assessment report we need to write. I can see we will be spending a lot of time to write the reports. What will this do to our program revisioning process?

December 11, 2000 Joyce

I have been working with an area principal who is interested in developing a school-university partnership to help inservice and preservice teachers and to help the students in his elementary school. We have been working with a grant writer to get money for the program. She recommended not to pursue a grant until we have a partnership that is more developed. Even though it is a goal for us, this is going to be difficult to do. The one UW-L faculty member working in the school this year is not tenured. I would like to help out there but am already on a teaching overload. So I am wondering how the partnership will continue to develop. I would also like to continue my work with my rural partnership to get the technology grant we were working on last year. It is difficult to find the extra hours to develop these partnerships when there is so often only one university faculty member assigned to the school and may also be assigned to several schools as once. How will we develop the partnerships to get the grants to develop the partnerships?

Fall 2000 Reflection: The Problem of Individual Visioning done Without Group Learning

Substantive change takes a great deal of time. People with leadership positions must realize the importance of giving their workers time to reflect, plan, analyze, and initiate change. Substantive change does not occur during casual conversations in the hallway or in the occasional free moments at the end of a meeting with an otherwise full agenda. Yet when there is not time to plan substantive change as a unified group of workers, what are individuals to do besides be renegade members who go out on their own to initiate change?

An example of the importance of time in the change process has been our own program meetings this semester. Out of four scheduled MLS meetings we had a quorum at the first meeting where we introduced the 5th Year Program. The 5th Year Program was on the agenda every other meeting, but without a quorum, no work was done. We do not want to try to initiate change without input from other faculty. We are well aware that a change agenda presented to others as a fait accompli has little chance of being successful if faculty feel no ownership in the process. People need to "buy-in" to program change if they are to do the work needed to initiate the change.

We recognize one of the reasons that many faculty were not able to be present at all of the meetings. Because of their teaching loads, many faculty only have Fridays to do work in PK-12 schools. Traditionally, Fridays were saved for meetings and program work, but as some faculty need to spend more and more time in schools, they have to use Fridays for this purpose. As a result, we do not have consistent quorums. A lack of quorums supports the work of renegade faculty who feel they must initiate change on their own in order to get needed work done. To be honest, if we had not done the 5th Year Program during the summer, we would not have had any discussion regarding program revision. With only one "official" meeting, faculty would not have had time to make plans for what we envision a new program could be.

Fullan (1993) discusses issues that arise in a paradigm for change. An important step in the change process is vision building. Personal purpose and vision are important starting points in the change process. Helping each individual to develop a focus and purpose is also important. Yet change is a non-linear process. Fullan argues that though personal vision is a starting point, organizational vision and strategic planning must come later in the process. Within an educational organization, faculty must immerse themselves in the issues to come up with a plan. The process of change, then, is as critical as the actual vision.

> In short, the critical question is not whether visions are important, but how they can be shaped and reshaped given the complexity of the change. Visions die prematurely—when they attempt to impose a false consensus suppressing rather than enabling personal visions to flourish. (Fullan, 1993: 30)

The comprehensive change process will take time. A side effect of labor intensification within an organization is that faculty members do not have the time needed individually and as a group to support the vision building and reflection needed to support organizational change. This was true for the faculty in the past academic year. Individually, faculty members may or may not have had time to study the need for change and goals they might have for the program. As a group, there was not the necessary time to spend studying the issue and possible directions to proceed. The need for faculty collaboration should be obvious.

Spring 2001 Journals

January 11, 2001 Judy and Joyce

We are just back from NCATE training in Washington, D.C. It was refreshing to have validation of some of our proposed program initiatives which, though not yet discussed, closely align with NCATE goals.

I (Joyce) came home and took the liberty to write a report detailing what our program has already done, what it needs to do, and what program faculty need in order to accomplish the goals. Hopefully, the information we learned from NCATE and the implementation report will provide the impetus for initiating change.

January 26, 2001 Joyce

On January 18, our School of Education meeting was devoted to work on the program assessment plan for the state accrediting agency. It was a full day meeting. I thought it would be a day for group work on the assessment plan and on program renewal. Instead, we just worked on preparing a program report that was a very separate process from looking at our entire program, its goals, and avenues for change. Then at today's January 26 SOE meeting, faculty members were reminded of how important it will be to attend meetings to make sure program renewal work can be accomplished this year. I hope this reminder helps because it seems as though we are getting less and less done because people

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

are not able to attend meetings. When they don't attend, our program faculty cannot proceed together to make change. Perhaps we need to consider what else we can do to plan program changes without going through committee work. I am concerned by the undemocratic nature of my comments but see little else we can do.

February 16, 2001 Judy

We used a program meeting day today to tally student evaluations for the purpose of preparing a program assessment report. It was a day of charting. I find it a bit frustrating that we wasted precious time that we could have spent in substantive program discussions doing tallying. Yet program faculty had requested the tallying be done in a program meeting since they could not find the time to do it otherwise. We came as close to a quorum as we had had all semester, and we didn't get to work on crucial program issues. I understand that labor intensification is a real issue in my life and other faculty members' lives. Yet, we need to focus more time and work on substantive issues instead of just procedural and technical issues unrelated to program development.

March 2, 2001 Judy

MLS meeting. Again, no quorum. ARGHHH!

March 23, 2001 Judy

We have had two more MLS Program meetings with no quorum. Those few of us present did discuss the 5th Year Program at today's meeting, which after six months on the agenda we ought to be doing at least that much. I was bewildered with what I saw as territorial issues coming through in the discussion. In an attempt to look at a more integrated approach to teacher education and blurring the lines of traditional courses, some faculty saw this as an attempt to cut back on their specialty area. Rather than looking holistically at the issues, some faculty only seemed to see their specialty areas.

April 20, 2001 Joyce

We had another joint program meeting to continue our work on our assessment plan. The discussion of the 5th Year Program was tabled, again, due to the pressing need to get the assessment plan completed. This is another example of procedural and technical issues competing with and superseding structural and systemic change.

May 4, 2001 Judy

I shared the 5th Year Program at the joint EML and MLS program meeting. By the time Joyce arrived after her class, we were on to the next agenda item since there was little discussion on the 5th Year Program. It was presented as if it were a point of information, not a springboard for possible change. Here it is the end of another school year and what have we accomplished? After the push to do the tallying and complete the assessment report (which took one of our program meeting days) the data has sat on my desk awaiting instructions from the powers that be on

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

what to do with the data. The state assessment plan, due July 1, is in limbo. I have not seen it since April 20 and I am supposedly one of the people in charge. In our department meetings we have worked on bylaw development 12 times with the final electronic vote yet to come. The 5th Year Program has been presented and is viewed problematically by faculty rather than as a springboard for discussion on programmatic change. Where do we go next?

Spring 2001 Reflection: Final Analysis

"Change is a double-edged sword." (Fullan, 2001, p. 1)

Teacher education and teacher licensure are going through fairly substantial changes nationwide. As we, the authors, started the journaling process in this paper, it was easy for us to focus on labor intensification as a valid reason for the lack of substantial programmatic change. As we continued our journaling, we realized the need for us to focus on developing our own personal visions and program goals. To help develop our vision, during the summer of 2000 we discussed general goals about what we would like to see for our program. We reflected on program feedback data, visioned program options, and inquired into possibilities. The discussion led to the development of a model for a fifth year certification program for the middle level/secondary education students. We also did this partly out of frustration, believing that we could not wait for our entire program faculty to move forward with program renewal. We felt pressure to accomplish program reform to meet new certification requirements. We hoped this program design would act as an impetus for program change.

Over time, our journaling showed us that the two of us assuming informal leadership and presenting a program model was not the best way to initiate discussions on program reform. There are no shortcuts to change. A small group working on its own over time cannot plan and lead substantive change. Change cannot be accomplished when expecting the entire group to support a vision and change agenda developed by a few. As a result, the following themes emerged after our two-year journaling and reflection process.

The Importance of the Group Visioning Process

Our attempts to shorten the timeline of change actually worked to circumvent the process. We (the authors) had time over the summer to engage in reflective dialogue and develop our own personal visions; our fellow program faculty did not. Since program faculty had participated in group visioning about five years earlier, we had assumed that this past visioning process was enough to guarantee that we were all on "the same page." We were incorrect.

Fullan (1993) discusses the "Eight Basic Lessons of the New Paradigm of Change." In the paradigm is the emphasis that individuals and the group must have equal power in the change process. He also discusses that vision and strategic planning

must progress during the change process, for too premature of visions can "blind" the group. This concept can be an extremely difficult concept for those involved in university program revision. As important as it is to work together to accomplish a common vision during the change process, it is difficult to find time for such a commitment. Traditional university faculty work relies on individual work, often done in isolation. The current reward structure of tenure and promotion supports this solitary work. Faculty are supported for good teaching and for publishing. Time spent for programmatic reform does not seem to be valued. Hence, faculty are reluctant to spend the time to vision, particularly when it takes time away from other work. Therefore, organizational leaders need to think "outside the box" in terms of the tenure and promotion expectations for faculty who spend large amounts of time in PK-12 schools and in programmatic reform.

At an institutional level, a common focus on vision building to support change is necessary. An organization and its leaders must develop a shared vision-building process that is ongoing and comprehensive. Faculty must feel supported in taking the time to work together. There must be organizational structures to ensure this kind of environment. Norms and practices of inquiry must be supported. The organization must have a focus on organizational learning and development done in a collaborative work culture (Fullan, 1993, p. 12).

The Negative Effects of Rushing Change and Not Supporting Group Visioning

If the time needed to build a vision in a mutually supportive learning community is not respected, the result is an abbreviated learning and change process. Work sessions may lack direction because of a lack of a common focus. Over the course of months, when faculty experience meetings without a lot being accomplished, the natural result is for them to not be willing to sacrifice the time to attend meetings, which was certainly visible during our 2000-2001 school year. Faculty may have wanted change and program development, but since they lacked a common vision and had limited time to focus on change, little was accomplished. Chris Argyris (1993) defines organizational defensive routine as any policy or action that prevents organizations from changing. "Organizational defensive routines are anti-learning and over-protective" (p. 15). We saw this happening at three levels in our program.

A first level of defensive routine surfaced during meetings. There was a tendency in meetings to emphasize procedural and technical change processes where little substantive work was accomplished. Examples of this procedural and technical change include the Spring 2000 reorganization. Faculty spent a good part of that spring semester preoccupied with possible organizational structures. The faculty spent much of the following academic year developing policies and procedures for the new organization. Faculty were able to relax with the knowledge that, indeed, some work was done. Progress was being made. In reality, however, this type of change was defensive behavior, assuming action while protecting faculty from the need to risk and challenge themselves to produce substantive change. This is not to say that procedural

and technical change is not important. The problem occurs when procedural and technical change prevents faculty from moving toward structural/cultural change.

A second level of defensive routine occurs when faculty protect their own territory. When faculty feel challenged, it is easy for them to support their own work and routines, particularly when focusing on promotion, retention, and tenure issues. A "hidden pedagogy of survival" results (Argyris, 1993, p. 28). This tendency to circle the wagons around the status quo of educational practice is particularly easy to do during times of change. Bowman and Deal (1991) discuss Abraham Maslow's claim about the importance of safety from danger, attack, and threat in his hierarchy of needs. Faculty members feel the need to protect themselves and make sure they keep their jobs. This defensiveness may often be unrecognized while at the same time it works to resist change; hence, it is all the more powerful a force for resistance.

An example of territorial protection stems back to the program feedback data where program faculty examined graduating students' feedback. The data was collected, and themes emerged regarding program weaknesses. In reality though, there was never a full discussion by the faculty on the implications of the data and what it meant for program reform. As a result, no individual courses were questioned or challenged. Program faculty addressed the issues without acknowledging the problems and weaknesses. Territorial lines were not crossed.

Territorial issues as a form of resistance to change easily leads to a third level of defensive routine: renegade action. Faculty who want to initiate program change may find it easier to do so in "renegade" fashion. There may be some potentially good ideas in this kind of a change process, but the risk is that too few faculty will "buy in" to the change. The result is lower acceptance rates and a potential lack of cohesion and rapport from not working well together as a group.

An example of this was our own work on a 5th Year Program. We felt we were developing a program not as a blueprint for reform, but as a way to initiate discussions on a new MLS program. Our ideas came from research on learning, certification guidelines, NCATE standards, and program feedback from students, faculty, and PK-12 teachers. The result was to present a program as a fait accompli without the program faculty having the opportunity to vision the program and experience the change process in a holistic, collegial fashion.

Leadership to Support a Healthy Learning Community

To build a healthy organization, group learning must be a key focus. "Learning in schools, like profit in business, is what happens when schools do their business right. Learning is not, however, the business of schools. The business of schools is to design and invent high-quality intellectually demanding work for students" (Schlechty, 1997, p. 49) and, we as authors add, for educators. A key to building a healthy organization is to make the organization's focus that of a learning community.

Earlier in the paper we presented the ideas of the Holmes Group in its 1990 work *Tomorrow's Schools* which discusses a vision for professional development schools. Principles for PDS include continuous learning by students, teachers, and administrators; thoughtful long-term inquiry into teaching and learning; creating a learning community; and inventing a new institution through the process of working on these goals. Similar goals are important for any education organization. Individual faculty members must not only support collaborative work, but they must also learn together. Through collaborative learning, group members will slowly build a common vision and set of goals. The importance of this step should never be underestimated. Time should be made to support individual and group learning. Time should be made to challenge ideas and to dream of possibilities.

The environment of such a learning community must be based on constant rapport building and trust earned over time. Rapport and trust are as important as any goals. Innovation is not the biggest goal. Having the best ideas is not the main goal. The goal is to develop a learning environment achieved through a reculturation of the faculty (Fullan, 2001). This process supports and fosters commitment to the learning community. It can invigorate; it can revitalize.

The success of an organization in developing this kind of learning culture and spirit of inquiry depends on the leaders within the organization. There are two forms of leadership. In order for an organization to be healthy, one should not exist without the other. The organization must have the "leader" in place who is granted administrative power to move the organization forward. A second form of leadership is the broader concept that Lambert (1998) describes:

> When we equate the powerful concept of leadership with the behaviors of one person, we are limiting the achievement of broad-based participation by a community or a society. School leadership needs to be a broad concept that is separated from person, role, and a discrete set of individual behaviors. It needs to be embedded in the school community as a whole. Such a broadening of the concept of leadership suggests shared responsibility for a shared purpose of community (p. 5).

Therefore, university faculty share responsibility for creating a community in which the spirit of inquiry can be nurtured.

School restructuring research (Newmann & Wehlage, 1995) also describes new roles for educators within an organization. Traditional views support more of a top-down implementation of goals and standards. New research emphasizes the role of teachers as decision-makers. Educators should know their students' learning needs as well as anyone and, as a result, should assume leadership roles in decisions regarding curriculum, instruction, and assessment. In terms of teacher education, teacher educators have the knowledge of the preservice teachers' strengths and weaknesses. Teacher educators should know what PK-12 educators need and expect of future teachers based on feedback given by

those educators. With this knowledge and feedback, teacher educators should be the ones who have the ideas needed for program reform. They need to accept responsibility for determining program renewal and supporting their co-workers in this endeavor.

Good leadership becomes the process of supporting a healthy learning environment where a community renews itself through the learning process. Leaders are faculty members who support an inquiry into research and practice. Faculty members may question together, dialogue together, and debate together. A healthy learning community uses the learning process to build rapport and comfort in the change process. The process and the end result are inextricably linked.

Until organizations support faculty leadership to build and support change, substantive reform will be difficult. The change process is a very different avenue to traverse from traditional university practice. As a result, organizational leaders must support differing roads for faculty in their work, culture, and learning. If this change in culture does not happen, faculty should not be blamed for resisting change. Defensive behavior will abound if faculty are too fearful of change because of the need to protect their jobs. Organizational routines will live in the status quo if faculty do not see the possible success of change because they are all traveling on different roads.

The road to teacher education reform is a complex network of intertwining highways of practice, bridges to unknown places, and philosophical roadblocks. The route is long and winding. Developing a supportive learning environment may well be the best avenue to traverse such change.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

References

Argyris, C (1993). *Knowledge for action: A guide to overcoming barriers to organizational change.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ben-Peretz, M. (2001, January/February). The impossible role of teacher educators in a changing world. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(1), 48-56.

Bolman, L., & Deal T. (1991). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bolman L., & Deal, T. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform.* London: The Falmer Press.

Fullan, M (2001). *Leading in a culture of change.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M., Galluzzo, G., Morris, P., & Watson, N. (1998). *The rise and stall of teacher education reform.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

The Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers.* East Lansing, MI: Author.

The Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools.* East Lansing, MI: Author.

The Holmes Group. (1995). *Tomorrow's schools of education.* East Lansing, MI: Author.

Lambert, L. (1998). *Building leadership capacity in schools.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Louis, K., & Miles, M.B. (1990). *Improving the urban high school: What works and why.* New York: Teachers College Press.

National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1997). *NCATE draft standards for quality professional development schools.* Washington, D.C.: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Newmann, F.M., & Wehlage, G.G. (1995). *Successful school restructuring: A report to the public and educators by the center on organization and restructuring of schools.* Madison, WI: Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System.

Schlechty, P. (1997). *Inventing better schools: An action plan for educational reform.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Senge (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York: Doubleday.

Tierney, W.G. (2001, March). Reforming tenure in schools of education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82*(7), 550-554.

Wilson, R. (2001, January 5). A higher bar for earning tenure. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 47*(17), 12-14.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC®

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Traversing the Avenues of Change: The Difficult Road of Teacher Education Reform	
Author(s): Judy Beck Joyce Shunby	
Corporate Source: University of Wisconsin - La Crosse	Publication Date: April 5, 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1 ↑ [X]

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A ↑ [ ]

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B ↑ [ ]

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Judy Beck	Printed Name/Position/Title: Judy Beck	
Organization/Address: Univ. of WI - La Crosse 1725 State St La Crosse, WI 54601	Telephone: 608-785-8144	FAX: 608-785-8128
	E-Mail Address: beck.judy@uwlax.edu	Date: 4/5/02

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: info@ericfac.piccard.csc.com
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)